

REMARKS

This Application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated December 22, 2003. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 8-12 remain pending, with Claims 1 and 5 being independent. Reconsideration of the claims is expressly requested.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 8-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,097,147 (Baldo et al.) in view of JPA 07-169567 (Shoji et al.). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The present invention is directed to a luminescence device that has an oxygen absorbent disposed inside a structure that includes a substrate and a plurality of organic layers disposed thereon, as recited in Claim 1, or a structure including a substrate and a plurality of luminescence devices thereon, as recited in Claim 5.

More specifically, independent Claim 1 is directed to a luminescence device, comprising a substrate, an anode disposed on the substrate, and a plurality of organic layers disposed on the anode, which include at least a luminescent layer, an exciton diffusion prevention layer and an electron injection layer and a cathode disposed on the electron injection layer. The exciton diffusion prevention layer and the electron injection layer include an oxygen absorbent.

Baldo et al. is cited in the Office Action as teaching, in col. 2, lines 15-60, stacked electroluminescent devices that comprise an anode, a hole transporting layer, an emission layer, a blocking layer, an electron transporting layer and a cathode, with the blocking layer being used to block the diffusion of excitons. Baldo et al. is also cited as disclosing, in col. 4, lines 4-13, that a voltage is applied between the cathode and anode to

cause light emission from the emission layer. However, the Office Action admits that Baldo et al. does not disclose an oxygen absorbent in the device, as recited in Claim 1.

JPA 07-169567 is cited in the Office Action as disclosing an organic electroluminescent element that has an oxygen uptake layer. However, according to the abstract and Fig. 1), the oxygen absorbing layer 41 is disposed outside structure body 1, which includes substrate 11 and organic luminescent material 14. Nothing has been found, or pointed out, in JPA 07-169567 that would teach or suggest an oxygen absorbent which is present inside the structure body, much less one that is specifically present in an exciton diffusion prevention layer and an electron ejection layer, as recited in Claim 1.

Accordingly, even if Baldo et al. and JPA 07-169567 are combined (and assuming for argument's sake that such combination would even be proper, which Applicants do not concede), the result would not meet the terms of Claim 1, and that claim is therefore deemed clearly allowable over those two documents.<sup>1</sup>

Independent Claim 5 is directed to a luminescence device array that comprises a substrate and a plurality of luminescence devices disposed on the substrate. According to Claim 5, each luminescence device comprises a first electrode disposed on the substrate, at least one organic luminescence function layer disposed on the first electrode, a second electrode disposed on said at least one organic luminescence function layer, and an oxygen absorbent, with a space defined between a first luminescence device

---

1/

It is noted that the Office Action does not even assert that the proposed combination of Baldo et al. and JPA 07-169567 would contain an oxygen absorbent in the two layers specified in Claim 1. accordingly, the Office Action fails even to make out a proper *prima facie* case of obviousness as to that claim. This is also the situation with Claim 5, since again the location of the oxygen absorbent is not fully addressed in the rejection.

and a second luminescence device arranged next to the first luminescence device in one surface direction of the substrate, and the oxygen absorbent is Mg and is disposed in the space.

Again, nothing has been found, or pointed out, in either Baldo et al. or JPA 07-169567, that would teach or suggest providing an oxygen absorbent in a space between a first and a second luminescent device along a surface direction of a substrate, as recited in Claim 5, and Claim 5 is therefore also believed to be clearly allowable over those two documents, taken separately or in any proper combination (if any), for at least the same reasons as is Claim 1.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or the other of independent Claims 1 and 5, and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons as are those corresponding independent claims. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its merits is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the claims be allowed and that the case be passed to issue.